

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 21 2006

REMARKS**Non-Compliance**

This action is in response to a notice of not being fully responsive in a previous office action. The previous action included an error wherein the claims were not properly combined in an amended. To avoid confusion, this response replaces the response submitted to the Office on June 22, 2006. This response will therefore be directed to the Office Action dated March 22, 2006.

Paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Office Action

Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 USC §112 second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 4 and 5 have been cancelled. The limitations delineated in claims 4 and 5 have been rewritten to more accurately describe the structure taught in the specification and in the Figures.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested by the applicant.

Paragraphs 3-8 of the Office Action

Claims 1, 2 and 5 are rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 5,197,600 to Garcia. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 5,197,600 to Garcia. Claims 6-16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 2- 4 and 6 have been incorporated into amended claim 1. Based on the prior art of record and based on the Examiner's remarks, it is believed that claim 1, and all claims ultimately depending from claim 1, are now in condition for allowance.

The applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Paragraph 9 of the Office Action

Claim 17 is allowed.

New Claims

New claims 18-24 have been added to vary the scope of the claims. No new matter has been added and all references therein are fully supported in the specification and claims as originally filed. Claim 18 includes the combined limitations of originally filed claims 1 and 12. Based on the prior art and the Examiner's statements, it is believed that claims 18-24 are in condition for allowance. As claim 12 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim (claim 12 depended directly from claim 1), but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, the applicant has done just that in new claim 18. In particular, with respect to claim 18, the prior art does not teach a plurality of securing members wherein each of said securing members is attached to one of the housings for selectively extending over the opening and securing a disc case within the housing, and wherein each of the securing members includes a rod extending into and being pivotally attached to a first of said lateral sides, the rod being positioned adjacent to the opening, a first arm being attached to a second arm at a substantially perpendicular angle, the first arm being attached to the rod such that the second arm may be selectively positioned over and adjacent to the opening. For the above reasons, claims 18-24 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

5

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early consideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

10



Sean A. Kaufhold (Reg. No. 46,820)

P.O. Box 89626

15

Sioux Falls, SD 57109

(605) 334-1571 FAX (605) 334-1574

Date: 7/21/06